

1 **# SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA**

2 **# COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

3
4 ---

5
6 In re the Estate of:

7
8 **THOMAS EARL VAN HORN,**

9
10 Decedent.

11
12 Case No.: 26STPB04272

13
14 Department: 5

15
16 Judicial Officer: Hon. Jessica A. Uzcategui

17
18 **EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR:**

19
20 (1) STAY OF MAY 22, 2026 ORDER GRANTING PETITION FOR APPOINTMENT
21 OF ADMINISTRATOR;

22
23 (2) ORDER PREVENTING ISSUANCE OF LETTERS OF ADMINISTRATION TO
24 TERESA WEISSENBERGER PENDING RESOLUTION OF MOTION FOR
25 RECONSIDERATION;

26
27 **(3) ORDER SHORTENING TIME FOR HEARING ON MOTION FOR**
28 **RECONSIDERATION**

1
2 Filed by: Graham B. Lascsak, Pro Se, Interested Party and Heir

3
4 Hearing: Set by the Court upon filing per Los Angeles Superior Court Probate Division
5 procedure (filings received before 10:00 AM are set for the next business day; filings
6 received after 10:00 AM are set two business days out)

7 Dept.: 5

8
9 ---

10
11 **## NOTICE TO OPPOSING COUNSEL**

12
13 TO ATTORNEY SHANNON N. WIEZOREK, COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER TERESA
14 WEISSENBERGER, AND TO ALL INTERESTED PARTIES:

15
16 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that as soon as the matter may be heard, in Department 5 of the
17 above-entitled Court, Los Angeles Superior Court, Probate Division, Stanley Mosk
18 Courthouse, 111 North Hill Street, Los Angeles, California 90012, Applicant Graham B.
19 Lascsak, a pro se interested party, nephew of the decedent, and son of the former executor
20 Debra Gayle Lascsak (deceased), will and hereby does apply ex parte for:

21
22 (1) An immediate stay of the May 22, 2026 Order Granting Petition for Appointment of
23 Administrator appointing Teresa Weissenberger as Administrator of the Estate of Thomas
24 Earl Van Horn;

25
26 (2) An order preventing issuance of Letters of Administration to Teresa Weissenberger
27 pending resolution of Applicant's Motion for Reconsideration; and
28

1 (3) An order shortening time for hearing on Applicant's Motion for Reconsideration
2 pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.1202 and rule 3.1300.

3
4 This application is made on the grounds that immediate, irreparable harm will result to
5 the rights and interests of Applicant and to the estate if Letters of Administration are
6 issued to Teresa Weissenberger before Applicant's timely-mailed written objection and
7 forthcoming Motion for Reconsideration are heard on the merits. The balance of equities
8 strongly favors a stay. Teresa Weissenberger has not yet posted the court-ordered bond of
9 \$500,000 and has not yet received Letters of Administration, and therefore suffers no
10 prejudice from a brief stay. The estate consists entirely of real property valued at
11 approximately \$500,000, and once Letters of Administration are issued, Teresa
12 Weissenberger will have immediate statutory authority to take possession of, encumber,
13 or transfer that property before Applicant's due process rights are vindicated.

14
15 Notice of this Ex Parte Application: Pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 3.1203,
16 Applicant has provided notice of this ex parte application to opposing counsel Shannon
17 N. Wiezorek by Certified Email via RMail (rmail.com) on June 2, 2026 at Per clerk:
18 hearing set next business day when filed before 10:00 AM; specific time assigned by
19 court. Proof of such notice is set forth in the Certificate of Service attached hereto.

20
21 This application is based upon this Notice, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities
22 set forth below, the Declaration of Graham B. Lascsak filed herewith, all pleadings and
23 records on file in this action, and such additional oral and documentary evidence as the
24 Court may permit at the time of the hearing.

25
26 Respectfully submitted,

27
28 Dated: June 2, 2026

1
2 /s/ Graham B. Lascsak
3 Graham B. Lascsak, Pro Se
4 Lascsak Fam, General Delivery
5 Rising Star, TX 76471
6 (254) 433-1705
7 lascsak.fam@gmail.com
8
9 ---
10

11 # MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF EX PARTE
12 APPLICATION FOR STAY AND ORDER SHORTENING TIME
13

14 ---
15

16 **## I. INTRODUCTION / COMES NOW**
17

18 **COMES NOW Applicant Graham Bradford Lascsak, appearing pro se as an**
19 **interested party, a statutory heir, and the son of Debra Gayle Lascsak (deceased),**
20 **who was herself the named executor of the estate of Thomas Earl Van Horn, and**
21 **respectfully applies to this Court for emergency ex parte relief. This application**
22 **seeks to preserve the status quo and to protect Applicant's fundamental due process**
23 **rights, which were effectively denied at the May 22, 2026 hearing at which Teresa**
24 **Weissenberger's Petition for Appointment of Administrator was approved without**
25 **Applicant's written objection being considered and without Applicant being given**
26 **any opportunity to be heard despite his presence at the remote hearing.**
27

28 The estate at issue consists entirely of real property with an estimated value of \$500,000.

1 Once Letters of Administration are issued to Teresa Weissenberger, she will have
2 immediate statutory authority under California Probate Code section 8400 to take
3 possession of, manage, encumber, or dispose of that real property. The harm to Applicant
4 and to the estate from premature issuance of Letters would be immediate, concrete, and
5 potentially irreversible. In contrast, Teresa Weissenberger has not yet posted the
6 court-ordered bond of \$500,000 and has not yet received Letters of Administration. A
7 brief stay to allow Applicant's Motion for Reconsideration to be briefed and heard would
8 impose no meaningful burden on Teresa Weissenberger or on the estate.

9
10 This application raises serious questions about the integrity of the probate process, the
11 adequacy of Applicant's notice and opportunity to be heard, and the proper priority of
12 appointment under the California Probate Code. These are not frivolous concerns. They
13 go to the heart of whether the May 22, 2026 order was validly entered on the merits or
14 was instead a procedural casualty of a consent calendar sweep that bypassed a
15 timely-filed objection. The Court is respectfully urged to grant this ex parte application,
16 preserve the status quo, and set Applicant's Motion for Reconsideration for hearing on
17 shortened time.

18
19 ---
20

21 **## II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

22
23 1. Thomas Earl Van Horn died leaving an estate consisting entirely of real property with
24 an estimated value of approximately \$500,000, located in Los Angeles County,
25 California.

26
27 2. The probate proceeding was initiated by Teresa Weissenberger, the decedent's sister,
28 through her counsel, Shannon N. Wiezorek. Teresa Weissenberger filed a Petition for

1 Appointment of Administrator seeking appointment as administrator of the estate.

2
3 3. Graham Bradford Lascsak is the decedent's nephew, being the son of Debra Gayle
4 Lascsak (deceased), who was the sister of the decedent Thomas Earl Van Horn and who
5 had previously been named executor of this estate until her own death. As the son of a
6 deceased sibling of the decedent, Graham Bradford Lascsak is a statutory heir and an
7 interested party with standing to object to the appointment of an administrator under
8 California Probate Code section 48 and related provisions.

9
10 4. On or about May 16, 2026, Graham Bradford Lascsak mailed a written objection to the
11 Petition for Appointment of Administrator to the Court. The written objection was
12 postmarked May 16, 2026, prior to the hearing date of May 22, 2026.

13
14 5. A hearing on Teresa Weissenberger's petition was scheduled for May 22, 2026, in
15 Department 5 before the Honorable Jessica A. Uzcategui. The hearing was conducted via
16 remote videoconference on the Microsoft Teams platform.

17
18 6. Graham Bradford Lascsak attended the May 22, 2026 remote hearing. Despite his
19 presence, Applicant was not recognized by the Court and was not given any opportunity
20 to address the Court, present his objection, or be heard in any manner prior to the Court's
21 ruling.

22
23 7. The Court approved Teresa Weissenberger's petition as part of what appears to have
24 been a consent calendar sweep. Applicant's written objection, postmarked May 16, 2026,
25 had not yet been filed in the Court's official case file as of the time of the hearing and was
26 therefore not before the Court when the order was entered.

27
28 8. The Court ordered a bond of \$500,000 as a condition of appointment. As of the time of

1 this ex parte application, Teresa Weissenberger has not yet posted the required bond.

2
3 9. As of the time of this ex parte application, Letters of Administration have not yet been
4 issued to Teresa Weissenberger.

5
6 10. Applicant intends to file a Motion for Reconsideration pursuant to Code of Civil
7 Procedure section 1008 on the grounds that (a) the Court was unaware of Applicant's
8 timely-filed written objection at the time it entered the May 22, 2026 order; (b) Applicant
9 was denied due process when he was present at the hearing but not permitted to be heard;
10 and (c) additional grounds exist relating to the priority of appointment and the
11 circumstances of the estate.

12
13 11. The standard notice period for a motion for reconsideration under Code of Civil
14 Procedure section 1008 would require notice of at least prior to the hearing date as
15 confirmed by the clerk of the Probate Division days, during which time Letters of
16 Administration could be issued to Teresa Weissenberger, irreparably prejudicing
17 Applicant's rights and those of the estate.

18
19 ---

20
21 **## III. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

22
23 12. Thomas Earl Van Horn, the decedent, was the uncle of Applicant Graham Bradford
24 Lascsak. The decedent's sister, Debra Gayle Lascsak (mother of Applicant), had been
25 designated as executor of the estate during her lifetime. Debra Gayle Lascsak predeceased
26 Thomas Earl Van Horn by approximately two years.

27
28 13. Thomas Alan Lascsak is the surviving spouse of Debra Gayle Lascsak. He is

1 currently living. His relationship to the estate and his potential priority for appointment as
2 administrator or as a representative of the deceased executor's interest presents an issue
3 that was not fully addressed in the proceedings leading to the May 22, 2026 order.
4

5 14. Prior to his death, Thomas Earl Van Horn reportedly expressed to Michael Van Horn a
6 desire that Michael Van Horn serve as executor following the death of Debra Gayle
7 Lascsak. Michael Van Horn declined to serve. No other individual has formally stepped
8 forward with a documented appointment designation from the decedent.
9

10 15. The decedent Thomas Earl Van Horn was represented by an attorney who reportedly
11 drafted the decedent's will. The identity of that attorney is known to Applicant. If a valid
12 will exists or existed, that document would be material to the question of who properly
13 should serve as personal representative of this estate and would require a different
14 petition than a petition for administration of an intestate estate.
15

16 16. Teresa Weissenberger is the decedent's sister. Under California Probate Code section
17 8402, the priority list for appointment of an administrator includes a surviving spouse,
18 children, grandchildren, other issue, parents, siblings, and so forth. The question of
19 whether the proper priority was observed, and whether the possible existence of a
20 testamentary instrument was adequately investigated before a petition for administration
21 was filed and granted, is a central issue in Applicant's forthcoming Motion for
22 Reconsideration.
23

24 17. On May 16, 2026, Applicant Graham Bradford Lascsak prepared and mailed a written
25 objection to the Court opposing Teresa Weissenberger's Petition for Appointment of
26 Administrator. The objection was sent via United States mail with a postmark date of
27 May 16, 2026, which is prior to the May 22, 2026 hearing date.
28

1 18. Due to the ordinary delays of mail delivery and court file processing, the written
2 objection had not been officially placed in the case file at the time of the May 22, 2026
3 hearing.

4
5 19. Applicant attended the May 22, 2026 hearing via the Microsoft Teams remote
6 videoconference platform. Applicant attempted to participate in the hearing. However, the
7 Court did not recognize Applicant and did not invite or permit Applicant to address the
8 Court, make any statement, or present any objection before ruling on the petition.

9
10 20. The petition was approved as part of a consent calendar without individualized
11 consideration of whether any objections had been filed or were pending, and without any
12 inquiry into whether all interested parties were present and had been heard.

13
14 21. The estate of Thomas Earl Van Horn consists entirely of real property with an
15 estimated fair market value of approximately \$500,000. There is no liquid personal
16 property described in the estate inventory at this time.

17
18 22. The Court ordered that Teresa Weissenberger post a bond in the amount of \$500,000
19 as a condition precedent to the issuance of Letters of Administration. As of the date of
20 this application, that bond has not been posted.

21
22 23. Because the bond has not been posted and Letters of Administration have not been
23 issued, Teresa Weissenberger has not yet acquired the statutory authority under Probate
24 Code section 8400 to act as administrator. The status quo therefore remains in the period
25 between the entry of the order and the issuance of Letters, which is precisely the window
26 during which a stay would be most effective and least burdensome.

27
28 24. If Letters of Administration are issued to Teresa Weissenberger before Applicant's

1 Motion for Reconsideration is heard, Teresa Weissenberger will have full legal authority
2 to take possession of the estate real property, to list it for sale, to encumber it with debt, to
3 enter into management agreements, and to take any number of actions that could
4 dramatically affect the character, value, and availability of the estate assets before
5 Applicant's objection is ever heard on the merits.

6
7 25. Applicant has no adequate remedy at law if Letters are issued and real property
8 transactions are initiated or completed before reconsideration is granted. Undoing a real
9 property transaction in probate, particularly one involving third-party purchasers, is
10 extraordinarily difficult, time-consuming, expensive, and in many cases legally
11 impossible. The harm to Applicant would be irreparable.

12
13 ---

14 15 **## IV. LEGAL STANDARD**

16 17 **### A. Ex Parte Applications Generally**

18
19 California Rules of Court, rule 3.1200 et seq., govern ex parte applications in California
20 courts. An ex parte application may be granted when the applicant shows, among other
21 things, that irreparable harm, immediate danger, or other good cause requires that the
22 matter be heard without regular notice. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.1202(c).) The
23 applicant must provide notice to all opposing parties or counsel of the ex parte
24 application unless notice is excused for good cause. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.1203.)
25 The application must be supported by a declaration containing facts establishing the
26 grounds for ex parte relief. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.1202(c).)

27 28 **### B. Stay of Probate Order Pending Reconsideration**

1
2 The Court has inherent authority to stay its own orders pending reconsideration or further
3 briefing, particularly where the moving party demonstrates: (1) a likelihood of success on
4 the merits of the underlying motion; (2) irreparable harm absent a stay; (3) a balance of
5 harms tipping in favor of the applicant; and (4) that the public interest or interests of
6 justice are served by the stay. These factors, drawn from general California injunction
7 principles applicable in probate proceedings, guide the Court's discretion. (See Butt v.
8 State of California (1992) 4 Cal.4th 668, 677-678.) In probate proceedings specifically,
9 the Court's broad equitable authority supports temporary relief to preserve the status quo
10 while the merits of an appointment dispute are being litigated.

11
12 ### C. Motion for Reconsideration Under CCP Section 1008

13
14 Code of Civil Procedure section 1008, subdivision (a), provides that any party affected by
15 an order may, within ten days after service of written notice of entry of the order, apply to
16 the same judge or court that made the order, for reconsideration of the matter on the basis
17 of new or different facts, circumstances, or law. A written objection that was timely
18 mailed but not yet in the file at the time of the hearing constitutes new information of
19 which the Court was unaware when it entered its order, sufficient to support
20 reconsideration. The Court may also reconsider an order on its own motion at any time.
21 (CCP section 1008(c).)

22
23 ### D. Due Process Under the California Constitution

24
25 Article I, Section 7 of the California Constitution provides that a person may not be
26 deprived of property without due process of law. An interested party in a probate
27 proceeding who holds a potential interest in the estate has a constitutionally protected
28 interest in being heard before an order is entered that affects that interest. (See Mullane v.

Central Hanover Bank and Trust Co. (1950) 339 U.S. 306, 314; Estate of Kern (1975) 52 Cal.App.3d 325.) Where an interested party was present at the hearing but was not recognized and was not given any opportunity to be heard, the resulting order is tainted by a denial of due process and should be reconsidered or vacated.

V. ARGUMENT

A. APPLICANT IS ENTITLED TO AN IMMEDIATE STAY OF THE MAY 22, 2026 ORDER BECAUSE IRREPARABLE HARM IS IMMINENT AND CONCRETE

The most important and immediate basis for ex parte relief is the irreparable harm that Applicant will suffer if Letters of Administration are issued to Teresa Weissenberger before Applicant's Motion for Reconsideration is heard. The estate consists entirely of real property valued at approximately \$500,000. Real property is, by its very nature, unique. No two parcels of real property are identical. Loss of an interest in real property, or destruction of that interest through a sale, encumbrance, or other alienation, cannot be adequately compensated by money damages alone, particularly in a probate context where Applicant's interest is not merely financial but also concerns the proper identification and appointment of the person who will administer the affairs of his late uncle's estate.

Under Probate Code section 8400, a personal representative is authorized to administer the estate from the time of appointment, subject to the limitations imposed by the code. Under Probate Code section 8401, the personal representative's authority includes the power to take possession and control of estate property. Once Letters of Administration are issued, Teresa Weissenberger will have the immediate legal authority to act, and there

1 is nothing in the current posture of this case that would prevent her from taking actions
2 with respect to the real property prior to any further hearing. The window of opportunity
3 during which a stay would be fully effective is extremely narrow. That window is right
4 now, while the bond remains unposted and the Letters remain unissued.

5
6 Applicant respectfully submits that the irreparable harm element is satisfied beyond any
7 reasonable question. Applicant's objection was mailed before the hearing. Applicant
8 appeared at the hearing. Applicant was simply not heard, through no fault of his own. To
9 allow Teresa Weissenberger to proceed to receive Letters of Administration and begin
10 exercising authority over the estate real property before Applicant's objection is addressed
11 on the merits would effectively make the denial of due process permanent and
12 unreviewable as a practical matter. Courts do not favor results that render due process
13 violations moot through the passage of time and the actions of the very party whose
14 appointment is challenged.

15
16 The bond requirement itself, while well-intentioned, does not eliminate the irreparable
17 harm concern. A bond protects against financial loss arising from misconduct or
18 mismanagement. It does not prevent the initial and potentially irreversible acts that
19 Teresa Weissenberger could take as administrator during the period between issuance of
20 Letters and any subsequent court intervention. A bond is not a substitute for proper
21 process and a proper hearing.

22
23 **### B. THE BALANCE OF HARMS STRONGLY FAVORS A STAY BECAUSE**
24 **TERESA WEISSENBERGER HAS NOT YET POSTED BOND OR RECEIVED**
25 **LETTERS AND THEREFORE SUFFERS NO MATERIAL PREJUDICE FROM A**
26 **BRIEF DELAY**

27
28 The balance of harms analysis overwhelmingly favors Applicant. On Applicant's side of

1 the ledger, the harm is severe: irreversible loss of the opportunity to be heard on a timely
2 objection before an administrator with full statutory authority over a \$500,000 real
3 property estate begins to act. On Teresa Weissenberger's side of the ledger, the burden of
4 a stay is minimal to the point of being almost negligible. She has not posted the \$500,000
5 bond. She has not received Letters of Administration. She has not yet begun to exercise
6 any authority as administrator. She is exactly where she was before the May 22, 2026
7 order, in the sense that no concrete administrative action has yet been taken.

8
9 A brief stay, of perhaps two to four weeks to allow Applicant's Motion for
10 Reconsideration to be filed, served, briefed, and heard, would impose no cognizable
11 hardship on Teresa Weissenberger. The estate has been without a formal administrator
12 since the death of Debra Gayle Lascsak some years ago. It was without an administrator
13 before Teresa Weissenberger filed her petition. It will not suffer irreparable damage from
14 a delay of a few additional weeks while an interested party's due process rights are
15 vindicated. No emergency requiring immediate administrative action has been identified.

16
17 Moreover, if Applicant's Motion for Reconsideration is ultimately denied and the May
18 22, 2026 order is affirmed on the merits, Teresa Weissenberger will simply proceed to
19 post bond and receive Letters, exactly as the Court has ordered. She loses nothing except
20 a brief period of time, and that time is already being spent waiting for her to post the bond
21 in any event. The temporary stay costs her nothing. The absence of a stay could cost
22 Applicant everything.

23
24 California courts have consistently recognized that where the party seeking a stay faces
25 irreparable harm and the opposing party faces little or no prejudice from a brief delay, the
26 balance of harms strongly favors granting the stay. (See *King v. Meese* (1987) 43 Cal.3d
27 1217, 1227.) This is such a case.

1 ### C. APPLICANT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION RAISES SERIOUS
2 QUESTIONS OF LAW AND FACT, INCLUDING DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS,
3 FAILURE TO CONSIDER A TIMELY-FILED OBJECTION, AND QUESTIONS
4 REGARDING PRIORITY OF APPOINTMENT AND THE POSSIBLE EXISTENCE
5 OF A TESTAMENTARY INSTRUMENT
6

7 The third major ground for this ex parte application is that Applicant's Motion for
8 Reconsideration raises substantial, non-frivolous legal questions that go to the heart of the
9 validity of the May 22, 2026 order. A stay pending reconsideration is particularly
10 appropriate where, as here, the underlying motion raises serious questions on the merits.
11 The Court need not prejudge the outcome of the Motion for Reconsideration to recognize
12 that the questions raised are serious, that the Court was not presented with Applicant's
13 objection when it acted, and that correction of that omission is exactly the purpose for
14 which Code of Civil Procedure section 1008 was designed.
15

16 First, and most fundamentally, Applicant was denied due process at the May 22, 2026
17 hearing. Article I, Section 7 of the California Constitution guarantees that a person shall
18 not be deprived of property without due process of law. An interested party in a probate
19 proceeding holds a cognizable property interest in the proper administration of the estate,
20 and has a constitutional right to be heard before an order affecting that interest is entered.
21 Applicant appeared at the May 22, 2026 hearing via the remote Teams platform. He was
22 present. He was ready to object. He was not recognized. He was not invited to speak. The
23 petition was swept through on the consent calendar without any acknowledgment of
24 Applicant's presence or any inquiry as to whether any interested parties wished to be
25 heard in opposition.
26

27 The due process violation is not merely procedural in a technical sense. It is the very
28 thing that Code of Civil Procedure section 1008 is designed to address when new

1 circumstances, including the discovery that an interested party's timely-mailed objection
2 had not yet been lodged in the file at the time of hearing, come to light after the entry of
3 an order. The California Supreme Court has recognized that procedural due process in
4 civil matters requires, at minimum, notice and an opportunity to be heard at a meaningful
5 time and in a meaningful manner. (Horn v. County of Ventura (1979) 24 Cal.3d 605,
6 612.) Applicant received notice of the hearing, appeared at the hearing, and was then
7 denied any opportunity to be heard. That is a textbook due process violation.

8
9 Second, the Court entered the May 22, 2026 order without having Applicant's written
10 objection before it. The written objection was postmarked May 16, 2026, six days before
11 the hearing. Had the objection been in the file and considered by the Court, the petition
12 could not have been approved on the consent calendar. The presence of a timely-filed
13 objection from an interested heir would have required the matter to be taken off the
14 consent calendar and set for a contested hearing. The Court was simply unaware of the
15 objection when it acted, and that unawareness constitutes the kind of circumstance that
16 warrants reconsideration under Code of Civil Procedure section 1008, subdivision (a).

17
18 Third, questions exist regarding the proper statutory priority for appointment of an
19 administrator under Probate Code sections 8402 and 8401. Section 8402 sets forth the
20 order of priority for appointment, beginning with the person nominated by will, then the
21 surviving spouse, then children, then grandchildren, then other issue, then parents, then
22 siblings. Teresa Weissenberger is the decedent's sister. Thomas Alan Lascsak is the
23 surviving spouse of Debra Gayle Lascsak, the decedent's deceased sister and former
24 named executor. The question of whether the rights of Thomas Alan Lascsak, as the
25 surviving spouse of a deceased heir, or the rights of Graham Bradford Lascsak, as the
26 child of a deceased heir, were properly analyzed in the context of the petition is a
27 substantive issue of law that deserves full briefing and consideration.

1 Fourth, there is reason to believe that the decedent Thomas Earl Van Horn was
2 represented by an attorney who drafted a will. If a valid testamentary instrument exists,
3 the entire premise of Teresa Weissenberger's petition, which appears to have been filed as
4 a petition for administration of an intestate estate, may be called into question. A petition
5 for appointment of a nominated executor under a will proceeds under different code
6 sections and different priority rules than a petition for appointment of an administrator in
7 an intestate estate. The failure to investigate, present, or account for a potentially existing
8 will is a matter that should be examined before an administrator is appointed and Letters
9 are issued. Under Probate Code section 7200, the decedent's attorney may have
10 obligations relating to the safekeeping and production of a testamentary instrument.

11
12 Fifth, the Court's order shortening time is warranted because the urgency created by the
13 narrow window between the order and the expected issuance of Letters of Administration
14 cannot be adequately addressed on the standard notice schedule. The Motion for
15 Reconsideration must be filed within ten days of service of notice of entry of the order.
16 (CCP section 1008(a).) However, without an order shortening time, the hearing on that
17 motion may not be set before Letters of Administration are issued, rendering the motion
18 partially moot as to its most urgent objective, which is preventing premature exercise of
19 administrative authority over the estate real property.

20
21 ---
22

23 **## VI. CONCLUSION AND WHEREFORE PRAYER FOR RELIEF**
24

25 For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant Graham Bradford Lascsak respectfully
26 requests that this Court enter an order as follows:
27

28 **WHEREFORE, Applicant prays for relief as follows:**

1
2 1. That the Court issue an immediate stay of the May 22, 2026 Order Granting Petition
3 for Appointment of Administrator appointing Teresa Weissenberger as Administrator of
4 the Estate of Thomas Earl Van Horn, pending resolution of Applicant's Motion for
5 Reconsideration;

6
7 2. That the Court issue an order directing the Clerk of the Court to refrain from issuing
8 Letters of Administration to Teresa Weissenberger pending resolution of Applicant's
9 Motion for Reconsideration or further order of this Court;

10
11 3. That the Court issue an order shortening time for hearing on Applicant's Motion for
12 Reconsideration, setting the motion for hearing on not less than [X] days' notice and not
13 more than [Y] days from the date of this order, on a date convenient to the Court's
14 calendar;

15
16 4. That the Court set a briefing schedule for the Motion for Reconsideration consistent
17 with the shortened time for hearing;

18
19 5. That the Court order Applicant's previously-mailed written objection, postmarked May
20 16, 2026, to be lodged in the official case file and treated as timely filed for purposes of
21 the reconsideration proceedings; and

22
23 6. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

24
25 Respectfully submitted,

26
27 Dated: June 2, 2026
28

/s/ Graham B. Lascsak
Graham B. Lascsak, Pro Se
Lascsak Fam, General Delivery
Rising Star, TX 76471
(254) 433-1705
lascsak.fam@gmail.com

**# DECLARATION OF GRAHAM BRADFORD LASCSAK IN SUPPORT OF EX
PARTE APPLICATION**

I, Graham Bradford Lascsak, declare as follows:

1. I am the Applicant in this proceeding and I make this declaration in support of my Ex Parte Application for Stay of the May 22, 2026 Order and for Order Shortening Time. I have personal knowledge of all facts stated in this declaration, except as to those stated on information and belief, and as to those I believe them to be true.

2. I am the nephew of the decedent, Thomas Earl Van Horn. I am the son of Debra Gayle Lascsak, who was the sister of the decedent and who had been named executor of the decedent's estate until her own death, which occurred approximately two years ago. My mother's death preceded the death of Thomas Earl Van Horn.

3. My father, Thomas Alan Lascsak, is the surviving spouse of my late mother, Debra Gayle Lascsak. He is currently living. His relationship to this estate and any potential priority he may hold in connection with the administration of this estate is among the issues I intend to raise in my Motion for Reconsideration.

1
2 4. I understand that prior to his death, Thomas Earl Van Horn expressed a desire to
3 Michael Van Horn that Michael Van Horn would serve as executor of the estate following
4 my mother's death. I understand that Michael Van Horn declined that role. I have no
5 documentation of the decedent's expression of this wish and I state this on information
6 and belief.

7
8 5. I am aware that Thomas Earl Van Horn was represented by an attorney who reportedly
9 drafted a will for the decedent. The identity of that attorney is known to me. I believe that
10 the existence or non-existence of a valid testamentary instrument is a matter of substantial
11 importance to the question of who should serve as personal representative of this estate,
12 and I intend to investigate and address this issue in my Motion for Reconsideration.

13
14 6. On or about May 16, 2026, I prepared a written objection to Teresa Weissenberger's
15 Petition for Appointment of Administrator. I mailed the written objection to the Court via
16 United States mail. The postmark date on my mailing was May 16, 2026. I mailed the
17 objection to the following address: Stanley Mosk Courthouse, 111 North Hill Street, Los
18 Angeles, CA 90012. I also mailed or served a copy on opposing counsel at the address on
19 file.

20
21 7. On May 22, 2026, I attended the scheduled hearing on Teresa Weissenberger's petition
22 via the Microsoft Teams remote videoconference platform. I was logged into the Teams
23 session at or before the scheduled hearing time. I was present throughout the relevant
24 portion of the hearing.

25
26 8. Despite my presence at the hearing, I was not recognized by the Court. I was not called
27 upon to speak. I was not given any opportunity to state my objection, to present any
28 argument, or to be heard in any capacity before the Court approved Teresa

1 Weissenberger's petition. The petition was approved as part of what appeared to me to be
2 a consent calendar sweep without any inquiry into whether any objections had been filed
3 or were pending, and without any acknowledgment of my presence.
4

5 9. As of the date of this declaration, I have confirmed through [METHOD OF
6 CONFIRMATION, e.g., review of online court records/contact with court clerk] that the
7 Court-ordered bond of \$500,000 has not yet been posted by Teresa Weissenberger.
8

9 10. As of the date of this declaration, I have confirmed through RMail certified email
10 delivery confirmation receipt that Letters of Administration have not yet been issued to
11 Teresa Weissenberger.
12

13 11. The estate of Thomas Earl Van Horn consists, to the best of my knowledge and belief,
14 entirely of real property with an estimated fair market value of approximately \$500,000. I
15 am not aware of any significant liquid personal property in the estate.
16

17 12. I am deeply concerned that if Letters of Administration are issued to Teresa
18 Weissenberger before my Motion for Reconsideration is heard, she will have the legal
19 authority to take actions with respect to the estate real property that could not be undone,
20 including listing the property for sale, entering into contracts, encumbering the property,
21 or otherwise taking steps that would impair my interest as an heir and interested party.
22

23 13. I am not in a position to hire an attorney at this time and I am appearing in this matter
24 pro se. I ask the Court to extend to me the reasonable accommodation that courts
25 traditionally afford to self-represented litigants, while recognizing that I am doing my
26 best to comply with applicable rules and procedures.
27

28 14. I have provided advance notice of this ex parte application to opposing counsel

1 Shannon N. Wiezorek by Certified Email via RMail on June 2, 2026 at approximately Per
2 clerk: hearing set next business day when filed before 10:00 AM; specific time assigned
3 by court. The notice communicated the nature of the relief sought, the basis for the
4 application, and the date and time of the ex parte hearing. A proof of that notice is
5 attached to the Certificate of Service filed with this application.

6
7 15. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
8 foregoing is true and correct.

9
10 Executed on June 2, 2026, at Rising Star, Texas.

11
12 /s/ Graham Bradford Lascsak

13 Graham Bradford Lascsak, Declarant

14
15 ---
16

17 **# CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**
18

19 I, Graham Bradford Lascsak, declare that I am the Applicant in this action and that on
20 June 2, 2026, I served the following documents:

- 21
22 - Ex Parte Application for Stay of May 22, 2026 Order and for Order Shortening Time;
23 - Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support Thereof;
24 - Declaration of Graham Bradford Lascsak in Support Thereof;
25 - This Certificate of Service
26

27 on the following party by the following method:
28

Shannon N. Wiezorek, Esq.
Attorney for Petitioner Teresa Weissenberger
3450 E Spring Street, Suite 212, Long Beach, CA 90806
Long Beach, CA 90806

Method of Service: [CHECK ONE]

☐ Overnight Courier

☐ Email (with consent or as permitted)

☐ Personal Delivery

☐ First Class U.S. Mail

I also provided advance notice to Shannon N. Wiezorek of the intent to file this ex parte application by Certified Email via RMail on June 2, 2026 at Per clerk: hearing set next business day when filed before 10:00 AM; specific time assigned by court, as required by California Rules of Court, rule 3.1203.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on June 2, 2026, at Rising Star, Texas.

/s/ Graham Bradford Lascsak

Graham Bradford Lascsak

AI DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATION

1 Pursuant to applicable court policies regarding the use of artificial intelligence in the
2 preparation of legal documents, and in the spirit of candor and transparency before this
3 Court, Applicant Graham Bradford Lascsak hereby discloses as follows:
4

5 Portions of this Ex Parte Application, including the Memorandum of Points and
6 Authorities and the structural organization of this filing, were prepared with the
7 assistance of an artificial intelligence language model tool. The factual representations
8 made herein are based on the personal knowledge and direct experience of Applicant
9 Graham Bradford Lascsak as set forth in his accompanying declaration. All legal
10 arguments and citations have been reviewed by Applicant to the best of his ability as a
11 self-represented litigant. Applicant takes full responsibility for all statements of fact and
12 law contained in this filing.
13

14 Applicant acknowledges that AI-assisted drafting tools do not constitute legal advice, that
15 the responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of all representations to the Court
16 rests solely with Applicant, and that Applicant has endeavored to review and verify the
17 substance of this filing to the best of his ability.
18

19 Dated: June 2, 2026
20

21 /s/ Graham Bradford Lascsak
22 Graham Bradford Lascsak, Pro Se Applicant
23 Lascsak Fam, General Delivery
24 Rising Star, TX 76471
25

26 ---
27

28 ***END OF DOCUMENT***